

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 24, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (APA") in view of United States Patent No. 4,955,820 ("Yamada et al").

By this present amendment, claims 1, 2, 8 and 10 have been amended, and claims 16-20 are new. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested for claims 1-20 presented herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Yamada et al.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that that notch is generally parallel to the leg and the tail. In the rejection of claims 1-15, the Examiner acknowledged that the APA did not disclose a notch between the tail and the leg, but directed the applicant to Yamada et al as disclosing a notch. However, the notch disclosed in Yamada et al is not generally parallel to the tail and the leg. Rather, the notch of Yamada et al, as characterized by the Examiner, is notch shaped, thereby not parallel to either the leg or the tail. Thus, for at least this reason, the combination of APA and Yamada et al does not render amended independent claims 1 and 8 obvious. As claims 2-7 and 9-15 are ultimately dependent upon claims 1 and 8, respectively, the combination of APA and Yamada et al likewise does not render claims 2-7 and 9-15 obvious for at least the same reason. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Yamada et al.

Regarding amended claims 2 and 10, which are dependent on claims 1 and 8, respectively, the applicant has amended those claims to define the notch as an inverted U shape. The notch in Yamada et al is not an inverted U shape. Rather, it is shaped similar to a boomerang, or sideways lazy V shape. As such, claims 2 and 10 are not rendered obvious by the combination of APA and Yamada et al for this additional reason.

The applicant is also presenting new claims 16-20. These claims are neither anticipated, nor rendered obvious by APA and Yamada et al, whether considered alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in view of the amendment and remarks set forth above, and allowance of all currently pending claims is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: June 24, 2005

By: Robert J. Zettler
Robert J. Zettler
Registration No. 37,973
Attorney of Record

Mailing Address:
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax.: (630) 416-4962